UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,971	09/15/2003	Thomas F. Papallo	138562	1096

7590 09/15/2008

Paul D. Greeley, Esq.
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
10th Floor
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER	
WILLOUGHBY, TERRENCE RONIQUE	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2836	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/662,971
Filing Date: September 15, 2003
Appellant(s): PAPALLO ET AL.

Edward L. McMahon
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed August 7, 2008 appealing from the Office action mailed February 1, 2008.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,411,865	Qin et al.	6-2002
6,167,329	Engel et al.	12-2000
5,875,088	Matsko et al.	2-1999

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-11, 32, 35-36, 38 and 40-43 are is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qin et al. (6,411,865) and in view of Engel et al. (US 6,167,329).

Regarding claim 1, Qin et al. (Figs. 9-11) discloses the claimed method of protecting a circuit having power switching devices, the method comprising:

defining characteristics of a zone of protection of the circuit (col. 1, ll. 5-10);

defining a protection matrix based at least in part upon said characteristics (col. 1, ll. 5-10);

performing a zone protective function on said zone of protection using said protection matrix (Abstract and col. 8, ll. 23-38), wherein said protection matrix comprises a matrix of protection coefficients used by said protection function (col. 6, ll. 51-64), wherein the step of performing said zone protection function is based at least in part upon electrical parameters of said zone of protection (col. 2, ll. 14-32; col. 3, ll. 15-18 and ll. 57-67), said electrical parameters being communicated over a data network to a microprocessor (col. 7, ll. 56-66), said microprocessor performing said zone protective function (abstract, ll. 7-14; col. 2, ll. 5-7 and ll. 26-32); and controlling said microprocessor to perform zone protection of the switching devices based at least in part on said electrical parameters (col. 2, ll. 26-32; col. 3, ll. 57-67; col. 6, ll. 54-63; col. 8, ll. 47-55).

Further, Qin et al. in (Fig. 1) discloses bay units (22-28) which acquire current and digital input information and sends the acquired information to the central unit (20), which processes the information, and makes the protection zone selection, runs the differential protection algorithms and then sends back trip instructions to the associated circuit breakers (i.e. switching devices) in the CT branches (col. 3, ll. 57-67).

Qin et al. does not explicitly disclose controlling the microprocessor to provide instantaneous overcurrent protection.

However, Engel et al. in (Figs. 1-2) discloses a single electronic circuit breaker (10) comprising a microprocessor (24) for performing instantaneous overcurrent protection functions (abstract, ll. 4-8; col. 4, ll. 65-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the control device of Qin et al. with a microprocessor performing instantaneous overcurrent protection as taught by Engel et al. to improve the circuit interrupter by increasing sensitivity to the monitored current over its normal operating range.

Regarding claims 2 and 38, Qin et al. in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claims 1 and 32, wherein said zone protective functions is a plurality of zone protective functions, each of said plurality of zone protective functions being performed on said zone of protection based at least in part upon said protection matrix (Qin et al., col. 3, ll. 41-52).

Regarding claims 4 and 42, Qin et al. in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed method of claims 1 and 41. Qin et al. (Fig. 1) discloses sensing said electrical parameters with a sensor (col. 3, ll. 1-4), communicating signals representative of said electrical parameters (col. 2, ll. 23-32) to a module (22-28), and communicating said signals to said microcomputer (20), wherein said module, said sensor and said microcomputer are communicatively coupled over said network (col. 1, ll. 13-16).

Regarding claims 5 and 37, Qin et al. in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claims 1 and 32, further comprising: monitoring a topology of the circuit, said topology being based at least in part upon a status for each of the power switching

devices in the circuit, said status being either opened or closed; defining said zone of protection based at least in part upon said topology, and adjusting said zone of protection based at least in part upon changes to said topology (Qin et al., col. 4, ll. 58-64; col. 3, ll. 33-40).

Regarding claims 6 and 33, Qin et al. in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claims 1 and 32, wherein the step of defining said characteristics comprises defining a plurality of combinations of states of the power switching devices in said zone of protection, each of said states being opened or closed (Qin et al., col. 4, ll. 58-64).

Regarding claims 7 and 34, Qin et al. in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claims 6 and 33, wherein the step of defining said characteristics further comprises defining power flow configurations for said zone of protection based upon said plurality of combinations of said states of the power switching devices in said zone of protection (Qin et al., col. 3, ll. 41-52).

Regarding claim 8, Qin et al. in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 7, further comprising: defining a definition matrix (Qin et al., col. 6, ll. 60-61; col. 8, ll. 17-22) based at least in part upon said power flow configurations; and defining said protection matrix (Qin et al., Figs. 9-11 and col. 8, ll. 23-38) based at least in part in part upon said definition matrix.

Regarding claim 9, Qin et al. in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 6, further comprising: defining a zone state matrix (Qin et al., col. 6, ll. 54-61) based upon said plurality of combinations of said states of the power switching

devices in said zone of protection (Qin et al., col. 3, ll. 41-52); and defining said protection matrix based at least in part upon said zone state matrix (Qin et al., col. 6, 61-67).

Regarding claims 10 and 43, Qin et al. in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claims 6 and 32, further comprising opening at least one of the power switching devices in said zone of protection based upon said protection function (Qin et al., col. 8, ll. 10-17).

Regarding claims 11 and 40, Qin et al. in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claims 10 and 39, wherein a microprocessor is configured to operate each of the power switching devices in the circuit (Qin et al., col. 7, 60-65).

Regarding claim 32, Qin et al. in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said protection system for coupling a circuit having power switching devise and a zone of protection, the system comprising:

Qin et al. (Fig. 1) discloses a control processing unit (20) being communicatively couplable to the power switching devices (30-36) so that said control processing unit can perform all primary power distribution functions for the circuit (Engel et al., col. 1, ll. 56-68) and so that said control processing unit can perform a zone protective function on said zone of protection based at least in part upon characteristics of said zone of protection (Qin et al., col. 3, ll. 60-67), said characteristics being actual and possible characteristics (Qin et al., col. 2, ll. 24-33), wherein said control processing unit (Qin et al. , Fig. 2, (20)) utilizes a protection matrix to perform said zone protective function (Qin et al., abstract), said protection matrix being defined at least in part by said

characteristics of said zone of protection, and wherein said protection matrix comprises a matrix of protection coefficients used by said zone protective function (Qin et al., col. 6, ll. 51-64).

Regarding claim 35, Qin et al. in view of Engel et al. discloses the system of claim 32. Qin et al. (Fig. 1) discloses the claimed said system of claim 32, wherein said control processing unit (20) defines said zone of protection (col. 2, ll. 27-32).

Regarding claim 36, Qin et al. in view of Engel et al. discloses the system of claim 32. Qin et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 35, wherein said zone of protection is dynamic (col. 3, ll. 34-38; col. 4, ll. 61-64).

Regarding claim 41, Qin et al. in view of Engel et al. discloses the system of claim 32. Qin et al. (Fig. 1) discloses the claimed said system of claim 39, wherein said control processing unit (20) receives parameter signals representative of electrical parameters of the circuit, and wherein said control processing unit opens the power switching devices if a fault is detected in the circuit (col. 7, ll. 60-67 and col. 8, ll. 1-3).

4. Claims 12-16, 18-21, 44, 46-53, 55-57, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qin et al. (US 6,411,865) in view of Matsko et al. (US 5,875,088) and in view of Engel et al. (US 6,167,329).

Regarding claim 12, Qin et al. (Figs. 9-11) discloses the claimed method of protecting a circuit having power switching devices, the method comprising:

a defining characteristics of a zone of protection of the circuit (col. 1, ll. 5-10);

defining a protection matrix based at least in part upon said characteristics (col. 1, ll. 5-10); and

performing a zone protective function on said zone of protection using said protection matrix (Abstract and col. 8, ll. 23-38);

wherein the step of performing said zone protection function is based at least in part upon electrical parameters of said zone of protection (col. 2, ll. 14-32; col. 3, ll. 15-18 and ll. 57-67), said electrical parameters being communicated over a data network to a microprocessor (col. 7, ll. 56-66), said microprocessor performing said zone protective function (abstract, ll. 7-14; col. 2, ll. 5-7 and ll. 26-32); and controlling said microprocessor (col. 2, ll. 26-32) to perform zone protection of the switching devices based at least in part on said electrical parameters (col. 2, ll. 26-32; col. 3, ll. 57-67; col. 6, ll. 54-63; col. 8, ll. 47-55).

Qin et al. does not disclose determining a dynamic delay time for opening said at least one of the power switching devices; and opening said at least one of the power switching devices after said dynamic time has elapsed.

Matsko et al. discloses determining a dynamic delay time (col. 1, ll. 27-64 and col. 2., ll. 17-25 and ll. 41 thru col. 3, ll. 1-4) for opening said at least one of the switching devices; and opening said at least one of the power switching devise after said dynamic time has elapsed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided an adjustable time delay for opening and closing separable contacts for a circuit breaker as taught by Matsko et al. to the power switching device of Qin et al. to improve zone interlocks for electrical switching devices (Matsko et al., col. 3, ll. 39-40).

Both Qin et al. and Matsko et al. do not disclose a microprocessor performing instantaneous overcurrent.

However, Engel et al. in (Figs. 1-2) discloses a single electronic circuit breaker (10) comprising microprocessor (24) for performing instantaneous overcurrent protection functions (abstract, ll. 4-8; col. 4, ll. 65-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the control device of Qin et al. and Matsko et al. with a microprocessor performing instantaneous overcurrent protection as taught by Engel et al. to improve the circuit interrupter by increasing sensitivity to the monitored current over it's normal operating range.

Regarding claim 13, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of protecting a circuit having switching devices, the method comprising:

defining a plurality of combinations of states of devices disposed in a zone of protection of the circuit, each of said states being either opened or closed (Qin et al., col. 4, ll. 58-64);

defining characteristics of said zone of protection based at least in part upon said plurality of combinations of said states of the power switching devices disposed in said zone of protection, said characteristics being the actual and possible characteristics (Qin et al., col. 3, ll. 41-52); and

performing a zone protective function on said zone of protection based at least in part upon said characteristics (Qin et al., abstract);

determining a dynamic delay time (Matsko et al., col. 1, ll. 27-45 and col. 2., ll. 41 thru col. 3, ll. 14) for opening said at least one of the switching devices; and opening said at least one of the power switching devise after said dynamic time has elapsed,

wherein the step of performing said zone protection function is based at least in part upon electrical parameters of said zone of protection (Qin et al., col. 2, ll. 14-32; col. 3, ll. 15-18 and ll. 57-67), said electrical parameters being communicated over a data network to a microprocessor (Qin et al., col. 7, ll. 56-66), said microprocessor performing said zone protective function (Qin et al., abstract, ll. 7-14; col. 2, ll. 5-7 and ll. 26-32); and controlling said microprocessor to perform zone protection instantaneous overcurrent protection of the switching devices based at least in part on said electrical parameters (Engel et al., abstract, ll. 4-8; col. 4, ll. 65-67).

Regarding claim 14, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 13, wherein said zone of protection is dynamic (Qin et al., col. 3, ll. 34-38; col. 4, ll. 61-64).

Regarding claim 15, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 13, wherein the step of defining said characteristics further comprises defining power flow configurations for said zone of protection based upon said plurality of combinations of said states of the power switching devices in said zone of protection (Qin et al., col. 3, ll. 41-52).

Regarding claim 16, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 13, wherein said zone protective functions is a plurality of zone protective functions, each of said plurality of zone protective functions

being performed on said zone of protection based at least in part upon said protection matrix (Qin et al., col. 3, ll. 41-52).

Regarding claim 18, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 13, further comprising sensing said electrical parameters with a sensor (Qin et al., col. 3, ll. 1-4), communicating signals representative of said electrical parameters (Qin et al., col. 2, ll. 23-32) to a module (Qin et al., Fig. 1, 22-28), and communicating said signals to said microcomputer (Qin et al., Fig. 1, 20), wherein said module, said sensor and said microcomputer are communicatively coupled over said network (Qin et al., col. 1, ll. 13-16).

Regarding claim 19, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 13, further comprising: monitoring a topology of the circuit, said topology being based at least in part upon a status for each of the power switching devices in the circuit, said status being either opened or closed; defining said zone of protection based at least in part upon said topology, and adjusting said zone of protection based at least in part upon changes to said topology (Qin et al., col. 4, ll. 58-64; col. 3, ll. 33-40).

Regarding claim 20, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 13, further comprising opening at least one of the power switching devices in said zone of protection based upon said protection function (Qin et al., col. 8, ll. 10-17).

Regarding claim 21, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. `discloses the claimed said method of claim 20, wherein a microprocessor is configured to operate each of the power switching devices in the circuit (Qin et al., col. 7, 60-65).

Regarding claim 44, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 32, wherein said control processing unit (Qin et al., Fig. 1, 20) determines a dynamic delay time (Matsko et al., col. 1, ll. 27-45) for opening at least one of the power switching devices (Qin et al., Fig. 1, 30-36), and wherein said at least one of the power switching devices (Qin et al., col. 8, ll. 10-17), and wherein said at least one of the power switching devices is opened after said dynamic delay time has elapsed (Matsko et al., col. 1, ll. 27-45).

Regarding claim 46, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses a power distribution system comprising:

a circuit having power switching devise (Qin et al., Fig. 1, 30-36) and a zone of protection (Qin et al., abstract); and

a control processing unit (Qin et al., Fig. 1, 20) being communicatively couple to the power switching devices (Qin et al., Fig. 1, 30-36), wherein said control processing unit can perform all primary power distribution functions for the circuit (Engel et al., col. 1, ll. 56-68) and performs a zone protective function on said zone of protection based at least in part upon characteristics of said zone of protection (Qin et al., col. 3, ll. 60-67), said characteristics being actual and possible characteristics (Qin et al., col. 2, ll. 24-33),

wherein said control processing unit (Qin et al., Fig. 1, 20) determines a dynamic delay time (Matsko et al., col. 1, ll. 27-45) for opening at least one of said power switching devices (Qin et al., Fig. 1, 30-36), and wherein said at least one of said power switching devices is opened after said dynamic delay time has elapsed (Matsko et al., col. 1, ll. 27-45).

Regarding claim 47, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 46, wherein the step of defining said characteristics comprises defining a plurality of combinations of states of the power switching devices in said zone of protection, each of said states being opened or closed (Qin et al., col. 4, ll. 58-64).

Regarding claim 48, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 46, wherein the step of defining said characteristics further comprises defining power flow configurations for said zone of protection based upon said plurality of combinations of said states of the power switching devices in said zone of protection (Qin et al., col. 3, ll. 41-52).

Regarding claim 49, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said system of claim 46, wherein said control processing unit (Qin et al, Fig. 1, 20) defines said zone of protection (Qin et al., col. 2, ll. 27-32).

Regarding claim 50, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 49, wherein said zone of protection is dynamic (Qin et al., col. 3, ll. 34-38; col. 4, ll. 61-64).

Regarding claim 51, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 46 further comprising: monitoring a topology of the circuit, said topology being based at least in part upon a status for each of the power switching devices in the circuit, said status being either opened or closed; defining said zone of protection based at least in part upon said topology, and adjusting said zone of protection based at least in part upon changes to said topology (Qin et al., col. 4, ll. 58-64; col. 3, ll. 33-40).

Regarding claim 52, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 46, wherein said zone protective functions is a plurality of zone protective functions, each of said plurality of zone protective functions being performed on said zone of protection based at least in part upon said protection matrix (Qin et al., al., col. 3, ll. 41-52).

Regarding claim 53, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 46, wherein a microprocessor is configured to operate each of the power switching devices in the circuit (Qin et al., col. 7, 60-65).

Regarding claim 55, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said system of claim 46, wherein said control processing unit (Qin et al., Fig. 1, 20) receives parameter signals representative of electrical parameters of the circuit, and wherein said control processing unit opens the power switching devices if a fault is detected in the circuit (Qin et al., col. 7, ll. 60-67 and col. 8, ll. 1-3).

Regarding claim 56, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 55, further comprising sensing said electrical

parameters with a sensor (Qin et al., col. 3, ll. 1-4), communicating signals representative of said electrical parameters (col. 2, ll. 23-32) to a module (Qin et al., Fig. 1, 22-28), and communicating said signals to said microcomputer (Qin et al., Fig. 1, 20), wherein said module, said sensor and said microcomputer are communicatively coupled over said network (Qin et al., col. 1, ll. 13-16).

Regarding claim 57,Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said method of claim 46, further comprising opening at least one of the power switching devices in said zone of protection based upon said protection function (Qin et al., col. 8, ll. 10-17).

Regarding claim 59, Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al. discloses the claimed said system of claim 46, wherein said control processing unit (Qin et al., Fig. 1, 20) utilizes a protection matrix (Qin et al., col. 2, ll. 26-32), said protection matrix being defined at least in part by said characteristic of said zone of protection (Qin et al., col. 8, ll. 23-38).

(10) Response to Arguments

The Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-11, 32, 35, 36, 38 and 40-43 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) For Obviousness Based upon Qin et al. in view of Engel et al.

Appellant argues that Qin et al. do not disclose or suggest that the central unit 20 performs both the zone protective function and the instantaneous overcurrent protection as recited in claims 1, 12, and 13.

In response, it was never the Examiner's position that Qin et al. taught both the zone protective function and the instantaneous overcurrent protection. Rather, it is the Examiner's position that Qin et al. disclose the claimed zone protective function, while Engel et al. disclose the instantaneous overcurrent protection recited in the claims, and it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine their teachings in order to provide instantaneous overcurrent protection in a power distribution system which includes zone protection. The Appellant is reminded that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Appellant also argues that Engel only performs the instantaneous overcurrent protection for a single switching device. Again, it was never the Examiner's position that Engel disclosed instantaneous overcurrent protection of the switching <u>devices</u> (emphasis added). Rather, is the Examiner's position that Qin et al. disclose in Fig. 1 a protective circuit having power switching devices 30-36, along with zone protection. See, for example, col. 6, lines 54-67. Qin et al. do not disclose instantaneous overcurrent protection. For this teaching, Engel was relied upon since he taught in Figs. 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 65-67 a microprocessor 24 which provides instantaneous

overcurrent protection. It is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the protective system of Qin et al. and add instantaneous overcurrent protection as taught by Engel for the purpose of providing instantaneous overcurrent protection to the power distribution system disclosed by Qin et al. Surely, one of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate that the system of Qin et al., which includes several circuit breakers, is just as susceptible to overcurrents as the single circuit breaker system disclosed by Engel. One of ordinary skill in the art would most certainly protect the entire distribution system of Qin et al. against overcurrents, and not just a portion which contains only a single circuit breaker.

The Rejection of Claims 12-16, 81-21, 44, 46-53, 55-57 and 59 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) For Obviousness Based upon Qin et al. in view of Matsko et al. and in view of Engel et al.

Appellant's argues that Qin et al. does not disclose or suggest that the control processing unit performs both the zone of protection and all primary power distribution functions (i.e. instantaneous overcurrent protection) as recited in the independent claims 32 and 46. Again, Appellant argues similar limitations as addressed above in independent claim 1, in which Qin et al. does not disclose or suggest that the microprocessor (i.e. central unit 20) performs both the zone protective function and the instantaneous overcurrent protection as recited in independent claim 12.

Appellant also argues similar limitations as addressed above in independent claim 1, in which Engel et al. does not disclose that the microprocessor 24 performs all

primary power distribution functions (i.e. instantaneous overcurrent protection) for the circuit power distribution system as claimed.

Appellant also argues that Matsko does not disclose or suggest the claimed microprocessor that performs both the zone protective function and all primary power distribution functions (i.e. instantaneous overcurrent protection). However, the Examiner would like to point out to the Appellant that Matsko et al. was <u>not</u> relied upon for disclosing either of those limitations recited in the claims 12, 32 or 46 as mentioned above. Rather, Matsko et al. were only relied upon for disclosing a dynamic delay time for opening said at least one of the switching devices after said dynamic delay time as elapsed (col. 1, ll. 27-64 and col. 2, ll. 17-25 and ll. 41 thru col. 3, 1-4). Again, it appears that the Appellant is trying to show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Terrence R Willoughby/

Examiner, Art Unit 2836

/Michael J Sherry/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2836

Conferees:

/Michael J Sherry/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2836

/Brian Sircus/
Brian Sircus
TQAS, TC 2800